

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/677,502	10/02/2000	Yoshio Hashibe	0694-134	0694-134 4484	
75	90 12/01/2006	EXA		MINER	
Bradley N. Ruben PC			SERGENT, RABON A		
463 First St. Suite 5A			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Hoboken, NJ)7030		1711	.	
			DATE MAILED: 12/01/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



Advisory Action

Application No.		Applicant(s)	
09/677,502		HASHIBE ET AL.	
Examiner		Art Unit	
Rabon Sergent		1711	

Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit					
•	Rabon Sergent	1711					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address							
THE REPLY FILED 20 November 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:							
a) \square The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.							
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL							
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in composition of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any e Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be 	xtension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e))), to avoid dismissal o	of the appeal.				
AMENDMENTS							
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);							
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bei	•	educing or simplifying	the issues for				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally re	jected claims.					
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1	, -						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):						
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a the non-allowable claim(s). 	·		-				
 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: 		ill be entered and an	explanation of				
Claim(s) allowed Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,2,4,6 and 8-12</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	•	•					
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 							
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a				
10.	on of the status of the claims after e	entry is below or attac	ched.				
 The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet. 	t does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	ince because:				
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).							
13. Other:		Labra Law Rabon Sergenson					
		Primary Examiner					

Art Unit: 1711

Continuation of 3.: Applicants' proposed amendment would raise the issue of indefiniteness with respect to claim 8, since it is unclear if the subject matter of claim 8 would be excluded by the amended language. Furthermore, the proposed transitional language has not been previously claimed; therefore, it has not been previously established what would have a material effect and therefore it has not been established what is excluded by the language.

Continuation of 11.: The prior art rejection has been maintained for the reasons set forth within the final Office action and in view of the fact that the arguments are largely based upon an amendment that will not be entered. The 35 USC 112, first paragraph rejection has been maintained for the reasons previously set forth. Furthermore, applicants argue that, by example, they have shown reflectances of less than 33%, in view of the absorption values in the examples and the disclosure that the film has an average transmittance of 60% or more. This argument is fundamentally flawed for the following reasons. Firstly, by example, applicants have only shown reflectance values of 12% and 19%, and contrary to applicants' position, the exemplified corresponding transmittance values of 81% and 74% cannot be ignored and cannot be considered to be equivalent to 60% or more. Secondly, applicants have not established that absorption is fixed at 7% for all films within the scope of the claims. Applicants simply have not provided adequate disclosure to support their position.

RABON SERGENT PRIMARY EXAMINER